## REMARKS

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 15, 18-19, 26-31 and 77-84 are pending, with claims 15, 31 and 77 amended, and claims 30 and 84 cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, by the present amendment.

In the Official Action, claims 30 and 84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; claims 77-81 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; claims 15, 26, 29-31, 77, and 83-84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson (Remote Desktop Environments Reflected in Local Desktop Windows); claims 18-19 and 78-80 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Johnson and Sigona (U.S. Patent No. 5,694,150); and claims 27-28 and 81-82 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Johnson, Sigona and Herndon (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,290).

Claim 77 is amended in response to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 15, 31 and 77 are further amended to more clearly describe and distinctly claim Applicant's invention. No new matter is added.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the telephone discussion between the Examiner and Applicant's representative on May 15, 2008. During the discussion, the Examiner clarified her interpretation of Johnson. The Examiner also acknowledged that Johnson does not appear to disclose or suggest terminals capable of publicly sharing some windows while keeping other windows private.

MRC/MEM:tm

Briefly recapitulating, claim 15 is directed to

A method, comprising:

displaying a first window on a first display device operatively connected to a control device;

displaying a second window on a second display device separate from the first display device, the second display device operatively connected to the control device;

editing content of the second window from within the second window;

displaying the edited content on the first window;

displaying a region on the second display device separate from the second window, wherein *contents on the region are not displayed on the first display device*;

updating the first window of the first display device by *dragging content from the region on the second display device to the second window*.

Claims 31 and 77 are directed to alternative embodiments of Applicant's invention, each embodiment reciting features substantially similar to those of claim 15.

Johnson describes a remote and local workstation capable of viewing each other's desktops. In Johnson, users can drag objects (copy or move) from a local window, representing a remote desktop environment, into the local desktop environment. Also, the local window can receive, by dragging and dropping (copy or move) an object from the local desktop environment.

However, Johnson does not disclose or suggest t publicly sharing some windows while keeping other windows private. That is, Johnson does not disclose or suggest a) editing content of the second window from within the second window; b) displaying the edited content on the first window; and c) displaying a region on the second display device separate from the second window, wherein *contents on the region are not displayed on the first display device*. Thus,

8

MRC/MEM:tm

Johnson also does not disclose or suggest d) updating the first window of the first display device by dragging content from the region (having contents that are not displayed on the first display device) on the second display device to the second window. That is, Johnson does not disclose or suggest displaying a public and a private display, and sharing the public display while not sharing the private display.

MPEP § 2131 notes that "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). See also MPEP § 2131.02. "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Because Johnson does not disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claims 15, 31 and 77, Johnson does not anticipate the invention recited in claims 15, 31 and 77, and all claims depending therefrom.

Sigona describes a multiple screen display driver system, with a corresponding plurality of user inputs, configured to provide a multi-user environment on displaced portions of a large virtual image space. In Sigona, a single computing system having an event-driven GUI operating system may receive input from the plurality of input devices and control the display or displays, providing each user apparent exclusive and uninterrupted control over a dedicated region or interactive control over a shared region or object.

In particular, Sigona describes two modes of operation. In a first mode, a plurality of users is intended to operate independently, without interference. In a second mode, one or more user inputs are intended to operate cooperatively. In the first mode, drag and double-click

MRC/MEM:tm

operations are not supported.[1] In the second mode, drag and double click operations are supported.[2] FIG. 5 of Sigona shows the first mode of operation, while FIG. 6 of Sigona shows the second mode of operation. FIG. 7 of Sigona shows a system optionally having both the first mode and the second mode of operation.

In the second mode of Sigona, *a window* may be dragged between display units by touching the window with one hand while simultaneously touching the intended location with the other hand, on a different display unit, and subsequently lifting the touch on the first display, whereby the window will move to the location on the second display unit.[3]

When a drag event is initiated in the second mode of Sigona, a first touch event is detected, with the series of coordinates used to move the object. So long as the touch is not interrupted, the window remains in a drag state. The interrupts caused by other simultaneous events are handled in queued sequence. This is especially true where touchscreens or input devices for each display have the same interrupt rate. The system hardware has sufficient bandwidth such that each input device has a fluid cursor movement and apparent full control over the system. Thus, multiple input devices may appear to simultaneously drag the same screen object fluidly as the object quickly moves back and forth to the position defined by each interlaced interrupt, without mutual interference.

However, Sigona does not cure the deficiencies of Johnson. Similarly, Herndon does not cure the deficiencies of Johnson. As none of the cited art, individually or in combination, discloses or suggests at least the above-noted features of independent claims 15, 31 and 77,

---

[1] Sigona, column 4, lines 10-20.
[2] Sigona, column 4, lines 43-44.
[3] Sigona, column 9, lines 49-54.

MRC/MEM:tm

Applicant submits the inventions defined by claims 15, 31 and 77, and all claims depending therefrom, are not rendered obvious by the asserted references for at least the reasons stated above.[4]

## *Conclusion*

All matters having been addressed in view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the immediate allowance of all pending claims.

Applicants' undersigned representative remains ready to assist the Examiner in any way to facilitate and expedite the prosecution of this matter. If any point remains an issue in which the Examiner feels would be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact Michael Monaco (Registration No. 52,041), or the undersigned, at the telephone number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

**Dated: July 11, 2008**

Respectfully submitted,

By

Michael R. Cammarata, Reg. No. 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicants

---

[4] MPEP § 2142 "...the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

MRC/MEM:tm